



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,385	09/16/2003	William J. Sequeira	057866-134130	1608
27148 7590 09/21/2009 POL SINELLI SHUGHART PC 700 W. 47TH STREET SUITE 1000 KANSAS CITY, MO 64112-1802				
EXAMINER				
STORK, KYLE R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/21/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,385

Applicant(s)

SEQUEIRA, WILLIAM J.

Examiner

KYLE R. STORK

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 24 July 2009.
2. Claims 27-39 are pending. Claims 27 and 34 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 27-29, 31-36, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 7356530, filed 10 January 2001, hereafter Kim) and further in view of Holland et al. (US 6507867, filed 22 December 1998, hereafter Holland) and further in view of Pettersen (US 6826594, filed 15 July 2000).

As per independent claim 27, Kim discloses a system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising:

a storage media comprising program code and a plurality of data structures, the plurality of data structures including:

a Page URL data structure storing data for use in identifying pages of interactive content (column 4, lines 45-58: Here, a URL management system (UMS) is used to store a page URL in a hash table)

a Page Partition data structure storing data for use in tracking partitions that make up a page of interactive content (Figure 1, item 14: Here, the content of a page is stored)

a Partition Link data structure storing data for use in tracking navigation data contained in a partition (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 3: Here, links contained with the page are stored. These links are used to navigate between various pages of the Internet)

a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to selecting and partitioning one or more pages of interactive Internet content (column 4, lines 30-44: Here, a crawler crawls the Internet. Each obtained page is categorized and stored, including a page's interactive links)

Kim fails to specifically disclose:

means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle; and

means for distributing the bundle to a client device

However, Holland discloses:

means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle (Figure 7, item 740: Here, each of a Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link are components of a web page. The bundling web server obtains the referenced data pages and constructs a bundle. This bundle inherently includes a Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link)

means for distributing the bundle to a client device (Figure 7, item 780)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed for efficient transfer of page components into a single packet.

Kim fails to specifically disclose partitioning each individual page into a plurality of partitions. However, Pettersen discloses partition each individual page into a plurality of partitions (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Pettersen with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to store page portions independently.

As per dependent claim 28, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further discloses wherein the Page URL data structure contains data regarding the URL of the selected pages and a unique identifier for each page (column 4, lines 45-58: Here, a hash table contains the URLs of each page. The hash data structure contains a unique key, which is used to access and identify the corresponding value (URL)).

As per dependent claim 29, Kim, Holland, and Pettersen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further discloses wherein the Page Partition data structure contains a unique identifier for each partition (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 3: Here, the Page Partitions are identified based upon the hash key associated with the URL of the page from which the partition was extracted).

As per dependent claim 31, Kim, Holland, and Pettersen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further

discloses wherein the Partition Link data structure contains data regarding location and destination of each link in a partition (column 4, line 45- column 5, line 3).

As per dependent claim 32, Kim, Holland, and Pettersen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 31, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically disclose wherein the coordinate system is selected from the group consisting of x-y coordinates, x-y-z coordinates, or polar coordinates. However, the examiner takes official notice that such coordinate systems were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as providing absolute positions for display of data items within a web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known location schemas with Kim, since it would have specified the absolute location of items on a web page.

As per dependent claim 33, Kim, Holland, and Pettersen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically disclose wherein the storage media is a disk. Holland discloses wherein the storage media is a disk (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to store data.

As per claims 34-36 and 38-39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 27-29 and 31-32, respectively. Claims 33-36 and 38-39 are similarly rejected.

5. Claim 30 is rejected and claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Holland, and Pettersen and further in view of Jeffrey et al. (US 2002/0083090, filed 27 December 2000, hereafter Jeffrey).

As per dependent claim 30, Kim, Holland, and Pettersen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 29, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically disclose navigation including previous and next steps. However, Jeffrey discloses navigation between data items including previous item and next item (paragraph 0052). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Jeffrey with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to easily navigate between data items.

As per claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 30. Claim 37 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 27-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178